

MORVILLO ABRAMOWITZ GRAND IASON & ANELLO P.C.

ELKAN ABRAMOWITZ  
RICHARD F. ALBERT  
ROBERT J. ANELLO\*  
KATHLEEN E. CASSIDY  
BENJAMIN S. FISCHER  
CATHERINE M. FOTI  
CHRISTOPHER B. HARWOOD  
LAWRENCE IASON  
BRIAN A. JACOBS  
TELEMACHUS P. KASULIS  
KAREN R. KING  
THOMAS A. MCKAY  
ROBERT M. RADICK\*  
JONATHAN S. SACK\*\*  
EDWARD M. SPIRO  
JEREMY H. TEMKIN  
RICHARD D. WEINBERG

565 FIFTH AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017  
(212) 856-9600  
FAX: (212) 856-9494

www.maglaw.com

WRITER'S CONTACT INFORMATION

(212) 880-9536  
bjacobs@maglaw.com

SENIOR COUNSEL  
PAUL R. GRAND  
COUNSEL  
JASMINE JUTEAU

ROBERT G. MORVILLO  
1938-2011  
MICHAEL C. SILBERBERG  
1940-2002  
JOHN J. TIGUE, JR.  
1939-2009

\*ALSO ADMITTED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.  
\*\*ALSO ADMITTED IN CONNECTICUT

April 18, 2024

**BY ECF**

Hon. Katherine Polk Failla  
United States District Judge  
United States Courthouse  
40 Foley Square, Room 2103  
New York, NY 10007

**MEMO ENDORSED**

Re: Bright v. United States, 23 Civ. 4524 (KPF) (S.D.N.Y.)  
United States v. Bright, 18 Cr. 56 (KPF) (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Failla:

In an Order dated January 2, 2024 (the "January Order"), this Court appointed me to assist Mr. Bright in his reply submission in connection with his motion for reconsideration of this Court's denial of his motion to vacate his conviction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. (Dkt. 27 at 4 (references to "Dkt." refer to the docket for 23 Civ. 4524 (KPF).) In the same Order, this Court set a deadline for the reply of April 19, 2024.

I write pursuant to Rule 4.B of this Court's Individual Rules of Practice in Civil Cases respectfully to request permission to exceed that rule's ten-page limit for reply memoranda, and for permission to file a reply brief of no more than 15 pages. An enlargement of the ten-page limit is appropriate here for several reasons. As this Court recognized in the January Order, the issues here are "novel[]" (Dkt. 27 at 3), and because Mr. Bright filed his motion *pro se*, the reply memorandum is the first time his novel arguments will be discussed in a counseled brief. Further, in its opposition letter (Dkt. 29), the government has asserted five independent numbered arguments, each of which the reply must address.

I have worked to draft a reply that is concise, and to pare it down to the extent possible. Because the reply must cover multiple discrete arguments, however, to cut the brief further would risk jettisoning arguments that would assist this Court in resolving the issues presented. Yesterday, I asked the government for its position on the request. The government requested a copy of the draft reply brief, which I provided as a courtesy. This morning, the government informed me that it objected to the request "in light of the new arguments raised" in the draft reply. Contrary to the government's view, however, all of the arguments in the reply are properly responsive arguments (and the government did not identify which aspects of the brief it

MORVILLO ABRAMOWITZ GRAND IASON & ANELLO P.C.

April 18, 2024  
Page 2

believes are “new”). In this regard, it is notable that the government’s own opposition letter fails at multiple points to discuss or to cite the applicable Second Circuit law, and in responding to the government’s arguments, it is necessary to discuss the relevant standards that are missing from the government’s papers. In any event, a determination of whether the reply papers are properly responsive should ultimately be for the Court.

Finally, it bears noting that the government’s own memorandum of law in opposition (Dkt. 29), which takes the form of a seven-page, single-spaced letter, does not comply with either Local Civil Rule 11.1 or this Court’s Individual Civil Rule 4.B, either in its formatting or its lack of a Table of Authorities and a Table of Contents (which would have been required in a properly formatted brief).

For all of the foregoing reasons, I request permission to file a brief of no more than 15 pages. I thank the Court for its consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brian A. Jacobs

Brian A. Jacobs

cc: All counsel (by ECF)

Application GRANTED.

The Clerk of Court is directed to mail a copy of this Order to Mr. Bright’s address of record, and to docket this Order in both cases listed in the subject line above. The Clerk of Court is further directed to terminate the pending motions at docket entry 31 (23 Civ. 4524) and 176 (18 Cr. 56).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 18, 2024  
New York, New York



HON. KATHERINE POLK FAILLA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE